arXiv:1605.08721v1 [math.PR] 27 May 2016

# ESTIMATING THE PROBABILITY OF A BIASED COIN VIA NASH-EQUILIBRIUM

D. BENKO [†], D. COROIAN, P. D. DRAGNEV [††], AND R. ORIVE [*]

Abstract. A biased coin game between two players is analyzed using minimax and maximin optimization problems. A Nash-equilibrium is established. The problem is completely solved and the Nash-equilibrium is shown to be unique for the case of one or two tosses. A conjecture is stated for the general case.

## 1. Introduction

The following problem is well-known in the area of probability. A biased coin is given, but the probability of heads is unknown. We flip it $n$ times and get $k$ heads. Estimate the probability of heads. This is called parameter estimation, because the probability of heads is a parameter of the coin. The most typical approach to solve this problem is the Maximal Likelihood method [7]. Let $p = P(heads)$. Then

$$P(k \text{ heads out of } n \text{ tosses}) = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}.$$

Since we have absolutely no information about $p$, we choose $p \in [0,1]$ for which this expression is maximal. This approach has several shortcomings. 1.) For small $n$ we get unrealistic estimations. For example, if $n = 1$ and we get a head, the method gives the estimation $p = 1$, and if we get a tail, the method gives $p = 0$. 2.) The method grabs the highest $p$, but does not take into account the error in the estimation. This can be seen in the following example. Suppose we are choosing a probability of the form $p \in \{0.2 + k/1000, k = 1, ..., 100\} \cup \{0.8\}$ and event $E_k$ $(k = 1, 2, ..., 101)$ occurs. Then, when $p = 0.2 + k/1000$, we have $P(E_k) = 0.2$, and when $p = 0.8$ we have $P(E_{101}) = 0.21$. If we estimate the value of $p$ using the Maximum Likelihood method, we obtain $p = 0.8$ because 0.21 is the highest probability. However, this is just slightly larger than 0.2 and for 100 choices of $p$ we have $P(E_k) = 0.2$. So we are better off choosing $p = 0.3$, for example, in order to avoid making a large error.

Another approach to estimating $p$ for a biased coin comes from decision theory ([3]), and requires the use of a loss or utility function. Our method also requires a loss function, but ours is different than the ones found in the literature. We solve the problem using game theory. There are two players: Player I and Player II. Player I selects a probability $p$, and Player II makes a guess $a_i$ for the value of $p$, knowing $i$, the number of heads out of $n$ tosses. They agree that Player II must pay $|p - a_i|$ dollars as a penalty to Player I. More generally, we will assume that $p$ can be a Borel probability measure on $[0,1]$, not just a fixed number, and so can the choices of $a_i$. The goal of Player I is to choose $p$ to maximize the penalty, while the goal of Player II is to minimize the penalty. The choices of these Borel measures are secretly made, however, we shall see that a Nash-equilibrium (see [5], [6]) of the best strategies exists, and because of this, they can be made public.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 62C20, 91A35 (41A10, 49J35, 91A05).

*Key words and phrases.* minimax and maximin optimization, biased probability, Nash-equilibrium.

[†] The research of this author was conducted while visiting IPFW.

[††] The research of this author was supported, in part, by a Simons Foundation grant no. 282207.

[*] The research of this author was supported, in part, by Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación under grants MTM2011-28781 and MTM2015-71352, and was conducted while visiting IPFW as a Scholar-in-Residence.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 contains a description of the problem, Section 3 contains our main result concerning the case of two tosses, and Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to the proofs of our main result.

## 2. Description of the game

This is a two-player game. Player I selects a probability $p \in [0,1]$ and creates a coin such that $P(heads) = p$. He tosses the coin $n$ times. Let $i \in \{0,1,...,n\}$ be the number of heads observed. Player I provides the value of $i$ to Player II. Then, based on this value, Player II makes a guess $a_i \in [0,1]$ for the value of $p$. Based on this guess, he will pay a $|p - a_i|$ penalty to Player I. Obviously, the goal of Player I is to maximize this penalty, while Player II wants to minimize it.

More generally, let $\Omega$ denote the set of all probability distributions on the interval $[0,1]$. Suppose that when making their decisions, Player I is allowed to choose $\mu \in \Omega$ and he picks $p$ to follow the distribution $d\mu$, and Player II picks $x_i$ to follow his choice of $d\sigma_i$ distributions, where $\sigma_i \in \Omega,\ i = 0,1,...,n$.

Therefore, the expected penalty of Player II is

$$E(\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n;\mu) = \int \cdots \int D(x_0,...,x_n;p)d\sigma_0(x_0)...d\sigma_n(x_n)d\mu(p), \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$D(x_0,...,x_n;p) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} |p - x_k| \tag{2.2}$$

is the expected penalty function given that $P(heads) = p$. In these terms, the goal of Player I will be to find

$$\max_{\mu\in\Omega} \min_{\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n\in\Omega} E(\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n;\mu)\,, \tag{2.3}$$

while the second player will try to get

$$\min_{\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n\in\Omega} \max_{\mu\in\Omega} E(\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n;\mu\,). \tag{2.4}$$

Now, the following theorem establishes the Nash-equilibrium.

**Theorem 2.1.**

$$\min_{\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n\in\Omega} \max_{\mu\in\Omega} E(\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n;\mu) = \max_{\mu\in\Omega} \min_{\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n\in\Omega} E(\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n;\mu). \tag{2.5}$$

**Proof**. The theorem is a consequence of Glicksberg's theorem [3]. For completeness we include a constructive illustration. Without loss of generality we can restrict to the case $n = 1$, the case $n > 1$ being easily generalized.

First, we prove the theorem under the assumption that $\sigma_0, \sigma_1$ and $\mu$ are supported on the discrete set $I := I_N = \{0, \frac{1}{N}, \frac{2}{N}, \ldots, \frac{N-1}{N}, 1\}$, where $N$ is fixed. Let $I \times I = \{c_j, j = 1,2,\ldots,(N+1)^2\}$. If $c_j = (\frac{m}{N}, \frac{l}{N})$, then Player II is choosing $c_j$ with probability $\sigma(c_j) := \sigma_0(\frac{m}{N})\sigma_1(\frac{l}{N})$. Player I is choosing $\frac{k}{N} \in I$ with probability $\mu(\frac{k}{N})$. Thus, Player II has $(N+1)^2$ choices, while Player I has $N+1$ choices. Then, Player II pays Player I $d(c_j;k) := D(\frac{m}{N}, \frac{l}{N}; \frac{k}{N})$, with probability $\sigma(c_j)\mu(\frac{k}{N}) = \sigma_0(\frac{m}{N})\sigma_1(\frac{l}{N})\mu(\frac{k}{N})$.

Thus, the game played on $I \times I \times I$ can be considered as a game played on a matrix sized $(N+1)^2 \times (N+1)$, and, for such games, the Nash-equilibrium exists. Therefore, the theorem is true on $I \times I \times I$.

Letting $N \to \infty$, we get finer and finer approximations of the function $D$ on the discrete grid $I \times I \times I$. Since $D$ is continuous, a standard argument utilizing weak$^*$ convergence completes the proof. $\square$

For our analysis it is important to make use of the following discretization of the probability distribution setting above.

**Theorem 2.2.** *The minimax problem for distributions* (2.5) *admits the following discretization*

$$\min_{\sigma_0,\ldots,\sigma_n\in\Omega}\max_{\mu\in\Omega} E(\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n;\mu) = \min_{a_0,\ldots,a_n\in[0,1]}\max_{p\in[0,1]} D(a_0,...,a_n;p)$$

(2.6)

$$= \min_{a_0,\ldots,a_n\in[0,1]} \|D(a_0,...,a_n;\cdot)\|_\infty\,.$$

**Proof**. Let $a_i := \int_0^1 \theta\, d\sigma_i(\theta)$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. Since $\displaystyle\int_0^1 |p-\theta|\, d\sigma_i(\theta) \geq |p-a_i|$, we have that

$$E(\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n;\mu) \geq E(a_0,...,a_n;\mu)\,.$$

Observe that, by the continuity of $D(a_0,\ldots,a_n;p)$, we get

$$\max_{\mu\in\Omega} E(a_0,...,a_n;\mu) = \|D(a_0,...,a_n;\cdot)\|_\infty.$$

Hence,

$$\min_{\sigma_0,\ldots,\sigma_n\in\Omega}\max_{\mu\in\Omega} E(\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n;\mu) \geq \min_{a_0,\ldots,a_n}\max_{p\in[0,1]} D(a_0,...,a_n;p)$$

On the other hand, if for fixed points $a_0,\ldots,a_n \in [0,1]$, we take $\sigma_i = \delta_{a_i}$, it is clear that $E(\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n;\mu) = E(a_0,...,a_n;\mu)$ and, thus

$$\min_{\sigma_0,\ldots,\sigma_n\in\Omega}\max_{\mu\in\Omega} E(\sigma_0,...,\sigma_n;\mu) = \min_{a_0,\ldots,a_n\in[0,1]}\max_{\mu\in\Omega} E(a_0,...,a_n;\mu)\,,$$

but, for some $\mu^*\in\Omega$,

$$\max_{\mu\in\Omega} E(a_0,...,a_n;\mu) = \int_0^1 D(a_0,...,a_n;p)\, d\mu^*(p) \leq \max_{p\in[0,1]} D(a_0,...,a_n;p) = \|D(a_0,...,a_n;\cdot)\|_\infty\,,$$

and this settles the proof of (2.6). □

Now, let $f(p) := D(a_0,\ldots,a_n;p)$ be an optimal penalty function in the sense of Theorem 2.2. Then, the following result will be useful.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let* $M(f) := \{x\in[0,1] \,:\, f(x) = \|f\|_\infty\}$ *the set of absolute maxima of* $f$. *Then,*

(i) $M(f)\cap\{a_0,...,a_n\} = \emptyset$.
(ii) $M(f)\cap[0,a_0) \neq \emptyset$, $M(f)\cap(a_n,1] \neq \emptyset$.
(iii) $M(f)\cap(a_0,a_n) \neq \emptyset$.

**Proof**. The proof of part (i) easily follows from the fact that, from (2.2), the derivative $f'(p)$ has a positive jump as $p$ passes through $a_i$ and, thus, $f(p)$ cannot be increasing/decreasing as we pass through $a_i$.

As for part (ii), suppose that $M(f)\cap[0,a_0] = \emptyset$. Then, $\max_{[0,a_0]} f(p) < \|f\|_\infty$. Since $a_0\notin M(f)$, we have that there is $\delta > 0$ s.t. $\max_{[0,a_0+\delta]} f(p) < \|f\|_\infty$. But then $\|D(a_0+\epsilon,a_1,\ldots,a_n;p)\|_\infty < \|f\|_\infty$, which is a contradiction. The argument that $M(f)\cap[a_n,1]\neq\emptyset$ is similar.

To prove (iii) we will first show that $a_0 \leq 1/2 \leq a_n$. Indeed, it is easily seen that $\|D(1/2,\ldots,1/2;p)\|_\infty \leq 1/2$, which implies that $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1/2$. Therefore, $a_0 = f(0) \leq \|f\|_\infty \leq 1/2$. Similarly, $1-a_n = f(1) \leq 1/2$, and thus $a_0 \leq 1/2 \leq a_n$.

Suppose now that $M(f)\cap[a_0,a_n] = \emptyset$. Because $a_0, a_n \notin M(f)$, there is $\delta > 0$, such that $[a_0-\delta, a_n+\delta]\cap M(f) = \emptyset$. Using a similar argument as in the proof of (ii), we have that for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough and $0 \leq p \leq a_0 - \delta < 1/2$,

$$D(a_0-\epsilon,a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1},a_n+\epsilon;p) = D(a_0,\ldots,a_n;p) - \epsilon\,[(1-p)^n - p^n] < D(a_0,\ldots,a_n;p)$$

We can also prove the same inequality for $a_n+\delta < p \leq 1$ from which we conclude that

$$\|D(a_0-\epsilon,a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1},a_n+\epsilon;p)\|_\infty < \|D(a_0,\ldots,a_n;p)\|_\infty = \|f\|_\infty,$$

which is a contradiction with the optimality of $f$. □

Next, the considerations above will be illustrated for the simplest case of $n = 1$ tosses.




FIGURE 1. Graph of $f(p)$ in the case of $n = 1$ tosses.

**Example: The Case of $n = 1$ Tosses.** Because of the simplicity and the symmetry of the problem, the method to find the strategies satisfying the Nash-equilibrium (2.5) can be carried out easily in this simple case. Therefore, we skip the details.

The optimal $\mu$ discrete strategy of Player I is the following: choose the atomic measure $\mu = \sum_{k=0}^{2} m_i \, \delta_{p_i}$, with $p_0 = 0, p_1 = 0.5, p_2 = 1$ and the corresponding weights given by $m_0 = 0.25, m_1 = 0.5, m_2 = 0.25$. Further, for $a_0 \in [0, 0.5], a_1 \in [0.5, 1]$, we have $E(a_0, a_1; \mu) = 0.25$ and for any $a_0, a_1 \in [0, 1]$ we have $0.25 \leq E(a_0, a_1; \mu)$. Thus, for any $\sigma_0, \sigma_1 \in$ we have $0.25 \leq E(\sigma_0, \sigma_1; \mu)$.

The optimal discrete strategy of Player II is the following: $\sigma_0$ is the unit point mass at $a_0 = p_0 = 0.25$, and $\sigma_1$ is the unit point mass at $a_1 = p_2 = 0.75$. The graph of $f(p) = D(0.25, 0.75; p) = (1 - p)|p - 0.25| + p|p - 0.75|$ is shown in Figure 1. Since for all $p \in [0, 1]$ we have $f(p) \leq 0.25$, we gain that for any $\mu \in \Omega$ we have $E(\sigma_0, \sigma_1; \mu) \leq 0.25$. So the Nash-equilibrium is established, and if both players follow the outlined strategies, then Player II pays $E(a_0, a_1; \mu) = 0.25$ dollars to Player I.

## 3. The case of $n = 2$ tosses

The following is our main result about the existence and uniqueness of strategies for Players I and II in order to reach the Nash-equilibrium in the case of two tosses.

**Theorem 3.1.** *The Nash-equilibrium is reached if the players use the following strategies:*

**Player I:** *Choose $p$ according to the distribution $\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{3} m_i \, \delta_{p_i}$, where*

$$p_1 = \frac{1}{3}\left(1 + \sqrt[3]{1 + 3\sqrt{57}} - \frac{8}{\sqrt[3]{1 + 3\sqrt{57}}}\right) \approx 0.3611 \tag{3.1}$$

*is the unique real root of the polynomial $x^3 - x^2 + 3x - 1$, and $p_2 = 1 - p_1 \approx 0.6389$, $p_0 = 0, p_3 = 1$. The weights $m_i$ are given by:*

$$m_1 = \frac{0.5}{p_1^2 + (1 - p_1)^2 + 1} \approx 0.325\,, \; m_0 = 0.5 - m_1 \approx 0.175\,, \; m_2 = m_1\,, \; m_3 = m_0\,. \tag{3.2}$$

**Player II:** *Choose the following values $a_i$*

$$a_0 = E[\mu] = \frac{2p_1(1 - p_1)^2}{p_1^2 + (1 - p_1)^2 + 1} \approx 0.1916\,, \; a_2 = 1 - a_1 \approx 0.8084\,, \; a_2 = 0.5\,. \tag{3.3}$$




FIGURE 2. Graph of $f(p)$ for $n = 2$ tosses

*Furthermore, the above pair of strategies is unique in the following sense: if the choice of distributions* $\{\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \mu\}$ *satisfies the Nash-equilibrium* (2.5)*, then* $E(\sigma_i) = a_i, i = 0, 1, 2$*, and* $\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{3} m_i \delta_{p_i}$*, where* $a_i, m_i$ *and* $p_i$ *are as above.*

The graph of the optimal penalty function given in Theorem 3.1, $f(p) = D(a_0, a_1, a_2; p)$, is shown in Figure 2. Observe that the following interlacing property $p_0 < a_0 < p_1 < a_1 < p_2 < a_2 < p_3$ holds.

Now we are ready to state the following conjecture about the case of $n$ tosses, and formulate an open problem for future investigation.

**Conjecture**. For the case of $n$ tosses, there exists a "unique" Nash-equilibrium (in the sense of $E(\sigma_i) = a_i$), namely, there exist $\{a_0, ..., a_n\}, \{p_0, ..., p_{n+1}\}$, and weights $\{m_0, ..., m_{n+1}\}$ in $[0, 1]$, that determine an optimal strategy. Moreover, the optimal penalty function has an equimax property, namely $f(p_i) = \|f\|_\infty$, for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n + 1$.

If the above conjecture proves to be true, an interesting question would be to determine the limit distributions of the optimal discrete measures $\nu_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \delta_{a_{i,n}}$, and $\mu_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} m_{i,n} \delta_{p_{i,n}}$ when $n$ approaches infinity.

We also remark, that the equimax property conjectured above and evidenced in Figure 1 and Figure 2, has a striking resemblance to equimax property of the optimal Lebesgue function as stated in the well-known Bernstein-Erdős conjecture proved by Kilgore [4] and deBoor-Pinkus [2].

The following two sections are devoted to the proofs of our main result, Theorem 3.1. Section 4 is concerned with the proof of the existence of the Nash-equilibrium, while Section 5 deals with the uniqueness problem.

## 4. Proof of the existence of the Nash-equilibrium for $n = 2$ tosses

From Theorem 2.2, we can assume that Player I and II are following discrete distributions. Let us assume that Player I is choosing $p$ according to $0 = p_0 \le p_1 \le p_2 \le p_3 = 1$, where the probability of choosing $p_i$ is $m_i$, for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$, with $\sum m_i = 1$. Taking into account the symmetry of the problem, we can also assume that $p_2 = 1 - p_1$, $m_0 = m_3$, and $m_1 = m_2$.

Thus, if Player II knows the outcome is $i$ heads ($i \in \{0,1,2\}$), his guess is $a_0, a_1$ or $a_2$, respectively. Notice (see (2.2)) that

$$D(a_0,a_1,a_2;0) = a_0,$$
$$D(a_0,a_1,a_2;p_1) = (1-p_1)^2|p_1-a_0| + 2p_1(1-p_1)|p_1-a_1| + p_1^2|p_1-a_2|,$$
$$D(a_0,a_1,a_2;p_2) = p_1^2|1-p_1-a_0| + 2(1-p_1)p_1|1-p_1-a_1| + (1-p_1)^2|1-p_1-a_2|,$$
$$D(a_0,a_1,a_2;1) = 1-a_2,$$

and so the expected penalty is

$$E(a_0,a_1,a_2;p_1) = \sum_{i=0}^{3} m_i D(a_0,a_1,a_2;p_i) = D_0(a_0;p_1) + D_1(a_1;p_1) + D_2(a_2;p_1)\,, \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_0(a_0;p_1) &= m_0 a_0 + m_1[(1-p_1)^2|p_1-a_0| + p_1^2|1-p_1-a_0|],\\ D_1(a_1;p_1) &= 2m_1p_1(1-p_1)[|p_1-a_1| + |1-p_1-a_1|],\\ D_2(a_2;p_1) &= m_1[p_1^2|p_1-a_2| + (1-p_1)^2|1-p_1-a_2|] + m_0(1-a_2). \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Next, we search for values of $p_i$ and $m_i$ such that $E(a_0,a_1,a_2;p_1)$ does not depend on $a_0,a_1,a_2$:

$$E(a_0,a_1,a_2;p_1) \equiv E(p_1),$$

under the condition that the interlacing property $p_0 \le a_0 \le p_1 \le a_1 \le p_2 \le a_2 \le p_3$ holds, that is, $a_0 \in [p_0,p_1], a_1 \in [p_1,p_2], a_2 \in [p_2,p_3]$. Under this assumption,

$$D_0(a_0;p_1) = a_0[m_0 - m_1((1-p_1)^2 + p_1^2)] + m_1[(1-p_1)^2p_1 + p_1^2(1-p_1)],$$
$$D_1(a_1;p_1) = 2m_1p_1(1-p_1)(1-2p_1),$$
$$D_2(a_2;p_1) = a_2[-m_0 + m_1(p_1^2 + (1-p_1)^2)] + m_0 - m_1[p_1^3 + (1-p_1)^3].$$

Thus, $E(a_0,a_1,a_2;p_1)$ will be independent of $a_0, a_1$ and $a_2$ if $m_0 = m_1[p_1^2 + (1-p_1)^2]$. Recall also, that $m_0 + m_1 = 0.5$. Solving these two equations yields

$$m_0 = \frac{0.5\,(p_1^2 + (1-p_1)^2)}{p_1^2 + (1-p_1)^2 + 1}, \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$m_1 = \frac{0.5}{p_1^2 + (1-p_1)^2 + 1}. \tag{4.4}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &E(a_0,a_1,a_2;p_1) = E(p_1)\\ &= m_0 + m_1[p_1^2(1-p_1) + (1-p_1)^2p_1 + 2p_1(1-p_1)(1-2p_1) - p_1^3 - (1-p_1)^3], \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

and substituting (4.3) and (4.4) in (4.5), we finally obtain

$$E(p_1) = \frac{2p_1(1-p_1)^2}{p_1^2 + (1-p_1)^2 + 1}\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Therefore, we must maximize $E(p_1)$ on $[0,1]$. The necessary condition $E'(p_1) = 0$, yields $p_1^3 - p_1^2 + 3p_1 - 1 = 0$. This polynomial equation has a single real root given by (3.1), for which $E(p_1) = E(0.3611...) \approx 0.1916$.

It is not necessary to verify that this value is indeed maximizing $E(p_1)$. Instead, we also define a strategy for Player II, and show that we have a Nash-equilibrium (2.5) with these strategies.

First, we claim that for any choice of $a_0, a_1, a_2 \in [0,1]$ we have

$$E(p_1) \le E(a_0,a_1,a_2;\mu)\,, \tag{4.7}$$

where $\mu$ is given by (3.1)–(3.2). Indeed, we have seen that if $a_0 \in [p_0,p_1], a_1 \in [p_1,p_2], a_2 \in [p_2,p_3]$, then $E(p_1) = E(a_0,a_1,a_2;p_1)$. But one can check that the value of $D_i(a_i;p_1)$ is increasing if $a_i \notin [p_i,p_{i+1}]$ ($i = 0,1,2$), so for any $a_0,a_1,a_2 \in [0,1]$ we have $E(p_1) \le E(a_0,a_1,a_2;p_1)$, establishing (4.7).

Now we define the strategy of Player II. Recall that (see (2.2))

$$D(a_0, a_1, a_2; p) = (1-p)^2|p-a_0| + 2p(1-p)|p-a_1| + p^2|p-a_2|. \tag{4.8}$$

Let $a_0 = E(p_1)$ (see (3.1) and (4.6)), $a_1 = 0.5, a_2 = 1 - a_0$. The graph of $f(p) = D(a_0, a_1, a_2; p)$ is shown in Figure 2.

Clearly, $f(0) = f(1) = a_0$. Direct but cumbersome calculations show that $f(p_1) = a_0$ and $f'(p_1) = 0$, and by symmetry $f(1-p_1) = a_0$, $f'(1-p_1) = 0$. One has $f'(0) = -f'(1) \approx -0.38$ and $f''(p_1) = f''(1-p_1) \approx -4.43$. Since $f$ is a continuous piecewise polynomial function whose restrictions to $[0, a_0]$ and to $[a_n, 1]$ are straight lines, while the restrictions to $[a_0, a_1]$ and $[a_1, a_2]$ are concave parabolas, it follows that the set of absolute maxima of $f$, $M(f)$, may not contain more than 4 points, which are precisely $0, p_1, 1-p_1, 1$. Thus, $\|f\|_\infty = a_0 = E(p_1) = 0.1916...$

Therefore, for any $\mu \in \Omega$ we have that

$$E(a_0, a_1, a_2; \mu) \le E(p_1)\,,$$

and the Nash-equilibrium (2.5) is established (see also (4.7)).

## 5. Uniqueness of the Nash-Equilibrium for $n = 2$ Tosses

We now focus on the uniqueness of the Nash-equilibrium. Let us briefly review the goals of the two players.

Recall that the strategy of Player II is to minimize the maximum of the penalty function, namely determine optimal outcomes $\{a_0, a_1, a_2\}$ defining an optimal penalty function $f(p) := D(a_0, a_1, a_2; p)$ (see (4.8)) such that

$$\min_{\{a_0,a_1,a_2\}} \max_p D(a_0, a_1, a_2; p) = \min_{\{a_0,a_1,a_2\}} \|D(a_0, a_1, a_2; p)\|_\infty = \|f\|_\infty\,. \tag{5.1}$$

That such an $f$ exists follows easily by a compactness argument.

The strategy of Player I is to find a probability measure $d\mu(p)$, supported on $[0,1]$, that maximizes the expected penalty no matter what the choice of Player II is, i.e. determine

$$\mathcal{F} := \max_\mu \min_{\{a_0,a_1,a_2\}} \int_0^1 D(a_0, a_1, a_2; p) d\mu(p). \tag{5.2}$$

Clearly,

$$\int_0^1 D(a_0, a_1, a_2; p) d\mu(p) \le \|D(a_0, a_1, a_2; p)\|_\infty,$$

so,

$$\min_{\{a_0,a_1,a_2\}} \int_0^1 D(a_0, a_1, a_2; p) d\mu(p) \le \|f\|_\infty,$$

which implies, after taking the max over all $\mu$, that $\mathcal{F} \le \|f\|_\infty$. Section 4 establishes sufficient coditions for equality to hold. The goal here is to show they are also necessary and hence define the Nash-equilibrium uniquely. Suppose that the selection of $\{a_0, a_1, a_2\}$ and $\mu$ is such that $\mathcal{F} = \|f\|_\infty$.

We start with the following Lemma establishing the relative positions of $\{a_0, a_1, a_2\}$.

**Lemma 5.1.** *The optimal outcomes $\{a_0, a_1, a_2\}$ satisfy $0 < a_0 < 0.2 < 0.4 < a_1 < 0.6 < 0.8 < a_2 < 1$.*

**Proof**. In Section 4 we exhibited a choice for $\{a_0, a_1, a_2\}$ where $\|D(a_0, a_1, a_2; p)\|_\infty = 0.1916\cdots < 0.2$. Therefore, $\|f\|_\infty < 0.2$. Since $f(0) = a_0$ and $f(1) = 1 - a_2$ we immediately obtain that $a_0 < 0.2$ and $0.8 < a_2$. On the other hand, if there exists $p \in [0,1]$ such that $|p - a_i| \ge 0.2$, $i = 0, 1, 2$, then $\|f\|_\infty \ge \min_i |p - a_i| \ge 0.2$, which is a contradiction. Thus, $\min_i |p - a_i| < 0.2$ holds for all $p \in [0,1]$. This implies that $0 < a_0$ and $a_2 < 1$ (otherwise, the Dirichlet Pigeonhole Principle implies there exists a $p$ such that $\min_i |p - a_i| \ge 0.2$).

To derive that $0.4 < a_1 < 0.6$ we need only use the values $p = 0.4$ and $p = 0.6$ to determine that from $\min_i |0.4 - a_i| < 0.2$ we must have $|0.4 - a_1| < 0.2$, or $a_1 < 0.6$, and from $\min_i |0.6 - a_i| < 0.2$ we must have $|0.6 - a_1| < 0.2$, or $0.4 < a_1$. $\square$

With respect to the set $M(f)$ of absolute maxima of $f$, the previous results in Lemma 2.3 above can be completed by showing that $\{0,1\} \subset M(f)$. Indeed, consider the restriction of $f(p)$ to $[0, a_0]$. Then, we have

$$f(p) = (a_0 - 2a_1 + a_2)p^2 - (1 + 2a_0 - 2a_1)p + a_0.$$

Since the global maximum is attained on $[0, a_0]$, and it is not at $a_0$, the only possibility of it not being at $p = 0$ is when $a_0 - 2a_1 + a_2 < 0$ and the $x$-coordinate of the parabola's vertex $(1/2 + a_0 - a_1)/(a_0 - 2a_1 + a_2) > 0$, or $1/2 + a_0 - a_1 < 0$. This implies that $a_1 - a_0 > 1/2$, which, as shown in Lemma 5.1, is impossible if $f$ is the optimal solution of (5.2). Therefore, we derive that $0 \in M(f)$. In a similar fashion one gets $1 \in M(f)$.

We are now ready to prove the uniqueness of the Nash-equilibrium.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Assume that the selection $\{a_0, a_1, a_2\}$ and $\mu$ correspond to a Nash-equilibrium. Then $a_1 = 0.5$ and $a_2 = 1 - a_0$, where $a_0$ is given in* (4.6)*. The measure $d\mu(p)$ is the discrete measure*

$$d\mu(p) = m_0\delta_0 + m_1\delta_{p_1} + m_1\delta_{1-p_1} + m_0\delta_1,$$

*with $m_0$, $m_1$, and $p_1$ given in Section 4.*

**Proof**. We already know that

$$d\mu(p) = \beta_0\delta_0 + \beta_1\delta_p + \beta_2\delta_q + \beta_3\delta_1,$$

for some $\beta_i \geq 0$, $\beta_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 = 1$, and $p \in (a_0, a_1)$, $q \in (a_1, a_2)$. Since we are in the case of Nash-equilibrium, the quantity

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(a_0, a_1, a_2) &:= \int_0^1 f(p)\, d\mu(p) = \beta_0 f(0) + \beta_1 f(p) + \beta_2 f(q) + \beta_3 f(1)\\ &= a_0\left[\beta_0 - \beta_1(1-p)^2 - \beta_2(1-q)^2\right] + a_1\left[2\beta_1 p(1-p) - 2\beta_2 q(1-q)\right] + a_2\left[\beta_1 p^2 + \beta_2 q^2 - \beta_3\right]\\ &\qquad +\beta_3 - \beta_1 p + \beta_2 q + 2\beta_1 p(1-p)^2 - 2\beta_2 q^3.\end{aligned}$$

is a global minimum (w.r.t. $\{a_0, a_1, a_2\} \in (0,1)$), which implies that

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial a_i} = 0. \quad i = 0, 1, 2.$$

Therefore, the coefficients in front of $a_0, a_1$, and $a_2$ vanish for the given choice of $p$, $q$, and $\beta_i$, $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Hence, the optimization problem (5.2) becomes a constrained minimization problem

$$Maximize \quad \beta_3 - \beta_1 p + \beta_2 q + 2\beta_1 p(1-p)^2 - 2\beta_2 q^3$$

$$Subject\ to \begin{cases} \beta_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 = 1\\ \beta_0 - (1-p)^2\beta_1 - (1-q)^2\beta_2 = 0\\ 2p(1-p)\beta_1 - 2q(1-q)\beta_2 = 0\\ p^2\beta_1 + q^2\beta_2 - \beta_3 = 0\\ p, q \in [0,1], \quad \beta_i \geq 0. \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

Eliminating $\beta_0$ and $\beta_3$ we reduce (5.3) to

$$Maximize \quad \beta_1 p(1-p)(1-2p) + \beta_2 q(1-q)(1+2q)$$

$$Subject\ to \begin{cases} 2[1 - p(1-p)]\beta_1 + 2[1 - q(1-q)]\beta_2 = 1\\ p(1-p)\beta_1 - q(1-q)\beta_2 = 0\\ p, q \in [0,1], \beta_i \geq 0. \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

Further, eliminating $\beta_2$ from (5.4) we derive

$$\begin{aligned} &Maximize \quad 2\beta_1 p(1-p)(1-p+q) \\ &Subject\ to \quad 2\beta_1 p(1-p)\left[\frac{1}{p(1-p)}+\frac{1}{q(1-q)}-2\right]=1, \quad p,q,\beta_1\in[0,1]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Substituting $2\beta_1 p(1-p)$ and denoting $x=1-p$, $y=q$, we arrive at the minimization of

$$Minimize \quad \frac{\dfrac{1}{x(1-x)}+\dfrac{1}{y(1-y)}-2}{x+y}, \quad x,y\in[0,1]. \tag{5.6}$$

Since $1/[x(1-x)]$ is a convex function, it is easy to see that if $x+y$ is kept constant, the minimum in (5.6) is attained when $x=y$, which implies that $q=1-p$ (and subsequently $\beta_3=\beta_0$ and $\beta_2=\beta_1$) is a necessary condition for a Nash-equilibrium selection. Moreover, assuming $x=y$, we obtain that $x$ minimizes the function

$$g(x)=\frac{1-x+x^2}{x^2(1-x)}=\frac{1}{x^2}+\frac{1}{1-x}.$$

Differentiating, we observe that $g'(x)=0$ has only one solution in $[0,1]$ satisfying $x^3=2(1-x)^2$, which shows $(1-p)^3=2p^2$, or $p=p_1$, where $p_1$ is given in (3.1). That $\beta_0=m_0$ and $\beta_1=m_1$ now easily follows. □

## References


[1] D. A. Blackwell, M. A. Girshick, Theory of games and statistical decisions, Dover Publications, 2012

[2] C. de Boor, A. Pinkus, *Proof of the conjectures of Bernstein and Erdős concerning the optimal nodes for polynomial interpolation*, J. Approx. Theory 24 (1978), no. 4, 289–303.

[3] I. L. Glicksberg, *A further generalization of the Kakutani Fixed Point Theorem with application to Nash-equilibrium*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 3 (1952), 170–174.

[4] T. A. Kilgore, *A characterization of the Lagrange interpolating projection with minimal Tchebycheff norm*, J. Approx. Theory 24 (1978), no. 4, 273-288.

[5] J. F. Nash, *Equilibrium points in N-person games*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 36, (1950), 48–49.

[6] J. F. Nash, *Non-cooperative games*, Annals of Math. 54, No. 2, (1951), 286–295.

[7] Pfanzagl, Johann, with the assistance of R. Hambőker, Parametric statistical theory, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1994.



Department of Mathematics and Statistics, ILB 325, University of South Alabama Mobile, AL 36688, USA

*E-mail address*: dbenko@southalabama.edu

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne, IN 46805, USA

*E-mail address*: coroiand@ipfw.edu

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne, IN 46805, USA

*E-mail address*: dragnevp@ipfw.edu

Departmento de Análisis Matemático, Universidad de La Laguna, 38200, The Canary Islands, Spain.

*E-mail address*: rorive@ull.es